

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

The Office Action objects to the drawings because Fig. 1 should allegedly be labeled as “Prior Art.” Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over the allegedly Admitted Prior Art (Fig. 1).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 6 to differently describe embodiments of the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-6 remain pending for consideration.

Objection to the Drawings

The Office Action objects to the drawings because Fig. 1 should allegedly be labeled as “Prior Art.” As reflected in the Submission of Replacement Drawing Sheets filed concurrently herewith, Applicants have added the legend “PRIOR ART” to Fig. 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over the allegedly Admitted Prior Art (Fig. 1). Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 6 to differently describe embodiments of the invention. To the extent that this rejection might be deemed to still apply to the claims as newly-amended, it is respectfully traversed as follows.

For example, claim 1, as originally-filed, recites “wherein said column electrode driver circuit, ... in said light emission period, opens the light emission column electrode line and

supplies a non-light emission control potential to column electrode lines other than the light emission column electrode line of said plurality of column electrode lines.”

Moreover, claim 1, as originally-filed, goes on to recite “wherein said row electrode driver circuit, ... in said light emission period, supplies a selection potential to the scan line and supplies a non-selection potential to row electrode lines other than the scan line of said plurality of row electrode lines.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action does not address these particular features in its rejection of claim 1. However, as explained, for example, at page 14, line 18 – page 15, line 5 of the instant application’s specification, these features provide significant advantages over the conventional arrangement of Fig. 1 in that a leak current is allowed to flow, via the parasitic capacitors of the organic EL elements on the non-scan lines. The leak current of the parasitic capacitors of the capacitively coupled non-light emission elements on the light emission column electrode lines is used as the drive current for the organic EL elements to be driven for light emission. Thus, a constant current driving circuit that conventionally was required for each column of the anode driver IC, as in the arrangement of Fig. 1, is not necessary in the arrangements of the instant application, thus allowing the anode driver IC to be simplified. See also, for example, the discussion at page 21, line 19 – page 22, line 6 of the instant application’s specification. These advantageous features are neither shown nor suggested by the arrangements discussed in the “Description of the Related Art” section of the instant application’s specification. Moreover, independent claim 6 differs from the arrangement of Fig. 1 for similar reasons as asserted above with regard to independent claim 1.

In an effort to expedite prosecution of this application, each of independent claims have been amended along the lines of these particular features to additionally recite that a selection

potential is supplied to the scan line and a non-selection potential is supplied to row electrode lines other than the scan line of said plurality of row electrode lines “so that a leak current flows into the capacitive light emitting element driven to emit light, as a drive current, via parasitic capacitors of the capacitive light emitting elements connected between said row electrode lines other than the scan line and the light emission column electrode line in said light emission period.” As discussed above, at least these particular features are neither shown, nor suggested in the applied arrangement shown in Fig. 1 of the instant application.

Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn because the applied arrangement shown in Fig. 1 of the instant application does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1 and 6, as amended. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, “[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.” Thus, “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).” Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 2-5 are allowable at least because of the dependence from independent claim 1, as amended, and the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the timely allowance of this application. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant’s undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: January 27, 2005

By:



Paul A. Fournier

Reg. No. 41,023

CUSTOMER NO. 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Tel: 202-739-3000

Fax: 202-739-3001

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please add "PRIOR ART" to Fig. 1, as reflected in the Submission of Replacement Drawing Sheets filed concurrently herewith.